

meeting, published in this number, gives a practically complete resume of the various expressions on the subject up to date, and Dr. Barbat certainly presents the case for the surgeon. In brief, the argument is simple. We have a certain section of the gut which is the seat of trouble due to its infection by organisms that live and thrive upon its normal contents, and which ordinary remedies seem to affect but little. Why not separate this section from the healthy, give this portion of intestine a complete rest, and thoroughly cleanse it from its contamination of germs? The argument is direct and simple; the discussion, in the months to come, should prove interesting.

Under this caption the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, in a recent issue, complains bitterly of the demoralized condition  
**DRUGGIST** of the drug store to-day. It is too  
**ETHICS.** true that the average drug store looks like a department store gone astray, or the wagon of some itinerant.

Commercialism has invaded entirely too much the proper domain of drug dispensaries, and it seems time for concerted action on the part of the medical profession to bring about the necessary reform. Meantime, much may be done to discourage the growing evil if physicians will encourage the filling of their prescriptions at pharmacies where more attention is paid to the proper dispensing of legitimate medicines than at the almost department-store variety shops that maintain a counter for prescriptions, but very evidently consider this an entirely secondary feature of their business.

But why shirk the blame and lay it all on the pharmacist? Who is it that can no longer write a prescription for his patient without "specifying" somebody's preparation, or somebody's mixture? The evil has grown from small things to large, but the pharmacist is not the only one who has nursed it along. The medical profession is quite as much responsible for the degeneracy in pharmacy of the day as is the druggist. It is the doctor who has been for years forcing the pharmacist from his profession into "commercialism," until now at least 75 per cent of the medicine used is ready-to-take mixed stuff which the manufacturer recommends for some line of ills, and the physician knows nothing about. Did the pharmacist commence the delightful game by asking the doctor to "specify" some particular make of chemical, because only one house could make it pure? Did he continue it by asking the doctor to "specify" some manufacturer's "preparation" of a U. S. P., or National Formulary preparation that he could make just as well himself, and at vastly greater profit? Did he further increase his own bad plight by asking the physician to "prescribe" (Heaven save the mark!) some "proprietary mixture" the formula of which the manufacturer did not wish to disclose for commercial reasons? Is

it the pharmacist or the physician who is so densely ignorant of his own profession that he accepts unquestioningly the idle statements that are told him; who does not know that *hexamethylene tetramine* is *hexamethylene tetramine*, even though it masquerades under seven different names? Is it the pharmacist or the physician who is so poorly equipped with information as to believe that different specimens of a chemical, having the same melting point, and in every other known respect the same identical thing, can have different therapeutic qualities? Is the pharmacist the only guilty agent in the prostitution of a noble profession to the ignoble greed of ignorant but unscrupulous manufacturers? Is it the pharmacist who first prescribes some nostrum "in the original package," to avoid substitution (of what, God only knows!) and then realizes that the patient can go to a store and ask for the same thing without first consulting the doctor? There is hardly a pharmacist in the country who would not gladly rid himself of half his stock of clap-trap stuff, if he could; but the physician will not let him, because, forsooth, he does not know enough about his own profession to know what he is using or what he is making the druggist do. It would be an even bet that the very editorial in question was written with a pencil bearing the name of some manufacturer of a "proprietary" medicine, the exact formula of which no one but himself and God can know. A little more talk about "doctors' ethics" would be more to the point. "First take out the beam which is in thine own eye."

If final action has not been taken on the "Heyburn Pure Food and Drug Bill, or H. R. 6295," before this issue of the *JOURNAL* reaches you, you should at once write to the Hon. W. B. Heyburn, U. S. Senate, Washington, D. C., and assure him of your hearty approval of this measure. Also write at once to the two Senators from this State and urge upon them the necessity of working for the passage of the bill. At the time of writing there is a fierce fight against it, put up by the manufacturers of secret proprietary medicines, nostrums, etc., and the blenders of bad whisky. The bill is very much the same as the bill that passed the House last year, but got lost in the "celebrated chamber of antiquities," the Senate. It establishes standards for foods and it provides for the proper formulation of standards for drugs and foods, and provides for their maintenance. It furnishes much that the people of the United States need, and that the medical profession has long suffered for. The fight is the fight of decency against unscrupulous greed, dishonesty, charlatanism,

quackery and fraud, and it behooves every self-respecting medical man in the country to make his influence felt.

Many of the better class of manufacturers of pharmaceutical preparations have repeatedly advised the editor that they decidedly approve of pure food and drug legislation, such as is now pending in the Senate. **THE REPUTABLE MANUFACTURERS.** This is a pretty good time for them to demonstrate the truth of the claim. Let them exert a little of their strength and influence—for they have plenty of both, and enough money—in counteracting the tremendous lobby now working against the Heyburn bill. A little of the practical politics which they all know so well how to use would fit in very nicely, just about this time, and would be a substantial indication of the truth of their pleasant-sounding words. We believe that many of them are honest in expressing themselves as they do in this matter, but there is a doubt that they will come out into the open and stand for the bill. Gentlemen, will you help us?

In its last issue the JOURNAL printed an editorial referring to this company, and more particularly to its "referee for this territory." We were advised that Dr. L. L. Dorr, long a distinguished member of the State Society, had retired from the office of referee and had been succeeded by Dr. W. W. Underhill. As the JOURNAL did not care to make the matter a personal one, no name was mentioned. We are informed by Dr. Dorr that he has not retired, but that Dr. Underhill is working in his office as inspector of risks and alternate medical examiner. The balance of the statement made is acknowledged to be true. The gentleman in question is a graduate in good standing and a member of the Missouri State Medical Association, but he has no license in California. Technically, the law would not apply to such cases; morally, it should, and these large and reputable corporations ought to be the first to live up to the uttermost letter of the statute, for their own protection if for no other reason. We are doing every possible thing to clean up the ranks of the medical profession and to keep them clean, and it is just such concerns that should help in the good work. As illustrative of his good standing, the JOURNAL is advised that the gentleman in question is a member of the A. M. A. In return we would respectfully call attention to the fact that, if he continues to reside in this state, he cannot retain his membership in the Association unless he becomes a member of a county medical society, and to do that he must be a licentiate.

Two things are very apt to be overlooked in considering this question. One is the fact that very few people seem to know or care whether they are getting pure milk or not; it all tastes alike to them. The other is the proper consideration of the producer. Unless all producers can be reached and dealt with, the factor of dishonest competition is bound to discourage the fondest endeavors. With the overwhelming majority of people, price is the one and only consideration involved in a milk transaction. Indeed, it is reported that in the great city of Philadelphia only three hospitals paid the slightest attention to the quality of the milk supplied them; with all the others it was simply a matter of price. When this sort of thing is found to exist in the one place where it should not be dreamed of, what can one possibly expect from the ordinary consumer? Certain fundamental requirements should be legally fixed and enforced upon all producers alike. But further than this, much educational work must be done by the medical profession if we are ever to awake the public to a realization that all milk is not alike, though it may taste so, and that price is not the only consideration—especially where the lives of children are at stake.

It is not very pleasant, when you have treated any one decently, to find that you have been lied to and imposed upon. Also, it is unpleasant to be forced to apologize for having innocently aided at an imposition. The JOURNAL offers its sincere apologies to each and every member of the Society, and to each one of its advertisers. For three months it printed a half-page advertisement that was a lie and a fraud. Fortunately a kind friend who is better posted upon subjects chemical than is any member of the Publication Committee, was good enough to point out the lie. Needless to say, the advertisement has been dropped. The firm indulging in this questionable—or rather, unquestionably dishonest—sort of thing, is the *Gardner-Barada Chemical Co.*, of Chicago. The advertisement was accepted only on the clear written understanding that a truthful formula should accompany it. The formula which these gentry sent in and which was published with their advertisement, proves, on investigation, to be purely mythical. There is no such chemical as "Lithium methamine," and the best chemists advise us that there cannot exist any such salt, or any other salt, of formalin. The obvious conclusion is that the stuff contains ingredients that are dangerous, or for which the manufacturers are ashamed, and it would seem well for the members of the Society to bear that fact in mind, and to leave this preparation (*Uriseptin*) absolutely alone.